

The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday (Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day).
Each volume contains twenty-six or twenty-seven issues.

Owner and Publisher, The Classical Association of the Atlantic States.

Place of publication, Barnard College, New York, N. Y.
Editor, Charles Knapp (Barnard College, Columbia University).
Address, 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York, New York.

VOLUME XXVIII, No. 18

MONDAY, MARCH 11, 1935

WHOLE No. 762

COMMENTS ON PROFESSOR CARR'S PAPER¹ III. BY PROFESSOR CHARLES KNAPP

Verily, verily there is nothing new under the sun! As long ago as 1908 I published an article entitled *The Reform of College Entrance Examinations in Latin*, in *The School Review* 16.520-532 (October, 1908). Because what I wrote then is still apposite I reproduce here parts of the article.

The view that the present requirements for admission to college are in general excessive is presented most earnestly, perhaps, by Mr. Wilson Farrand, of the Newark Academy; see the *School Review* for January last (Vol. XVI, pp. 12-41). I shall quote only what he has to say of Latin (p. 20):

"My fourth recommendation is that Latin and Greek composition shall be either eliminated or decidedly reduced. Composition is of unquestioned value in the mastery of a language, and I do not see how anyone can teach elementary Latin or Greek without its constant use, but when it comes to training, or trying to train, our pupils to write Latin like Cicero, or Greek in the style of Xenophon, my observation is that the results do not pay for the labor. I am aware that to many of you this view will appear heretical, and I do not propose at this time to argue it. I merely assert, as a thesis for discussion, that Latin and Greek composition in college-entrance requirements, should be limited to exercises designed to illustrate commonly used grammatical principles".

In this brief paragraph, Mr. Farrand seems to speak of composition as a highly valuable thing and yet to oppose it entirely or largely. I suspect that the confusion is a matter of definition of terms and that, consciously or unconsciously, he is taking advantage of the time-honored blunder of the colleges in using the word "composition" at all in connection either with entrance examinations or their undergraduate courses in the writing of Latin. No college of which I have knowledge has required candidates <for admission> really to *compose* in Latin. Mr. Farrand admits that no one can teach elementary Latin without the constant use of composition, by which I take him to mean constant practice in turning into Latin English sentences written by someone else and printed for him in a composition book. This is manifestly a far different and less difficult process than the one involved in true composition. If, as Mr. Farrand admits, this sort of work is essential to the teaching of elementary Latin, why take exception to the conduct of the colleges when they seek to discover, by entrance-examination tests, whether a given candidate has done this indispensable work?

Of our two sets of complainants <the representatives of the schools and the teaching staffs of the colleges> one, surely, is on a priori grounds entitled to far less consideration than the other. The schoolman by his very position is virtually incapacitated to see the problem aright. By that I mean that it is impossible for him to take a detached and impersonal view. His task is to prepare boys and girls for college; there is nothing final about his work, it is to be tested by a different tribunal.

The schoolmaster fears that his school will be judged by the mental performances of the pupils he sends up to college; he sees a close financial relation between those performances and himself. Naturally, therefore, he casts about at all times for some explanation for the failure or seeming failure of his pupils, some explanation, that is, that shall leave his own position impregnable. He not unnaturally wants less to do, he not unnaturally desires absolute uniformity of entrance requirements the country over; these things will enable him to conduct his school on the most economical basis possible, with the smallest number of teachers. He shuts his eyes therefore and asks the world to shut its eyes to the ceaseless distractions of school life, with the diminishing total of hours devoted by pupils to serious study, and throws all the blame on the standards set up by the college; in a word, asks the colleges to lower their standards because he cannot discipline his pupils.

I come now to the plea already mentioned that, if the quantity of the entrance requirements is reduced, the quality of the work done in the schools will be improved. So far as the classics are concerned, the experiment has already been tried, and with results wholly disastrous. As a matter of fact, taking the country as a whole, the quantity of Latin required for admission to college is less today than it was twenty years ago <1888>. Thirty years ago candidates in Latin were required to present Greek as well; they were required to know something of ancient history and ancient geography and to pass a respectable examination in scansion. Ancient <i.e. classical> history and geography were presently divorced from the classics (where they properly belong), and less and less stress was laid on scansion. Ancient history does, indeed, figure today in the subjects for admission to college, but as a thing divorced from the classics, as an optional subject. The instant result of the diminution of the requirement in classics was the disregard for Greek; it was no longer compulsory, it was no longer artificially stimulated, and so it was no longer taken save by the few. The Latin work itself has not profited in the meantime, though, if there were any value to the plea made, for example, by Mr. Farrand, we ought to have witnessed a marked improvement in the quality of the work done on what remained of the Latin requirements. The only result has been that classical students do not get ancient history or ancient geography as part of their classical work at all, and that the student in the freshman class who has had any adequate drill in scansion, that is to say, who has been made to feel that the form of immortal poetry is a vital part of that poetry, and is a thing worth serious study, is a *rara avis*. The schools know that the candidates will not be examined in such matters, or that, if the examination paper does contain these matters, the college instructor, realizing how weak the schools are in this regard, will attach virtually no importance to these questions. Unless all experience counts for naught, the reduction of the entrance requirements in Latin, the elimination of any subjects from the present list, will result merely in the failure on the part of the schools to regard these subjects at all, without corresponding increase in the effectiveness of instruction in what remains. A reduced curriculum in Latin will offer tempting opportunities for a reduction of expenses by a

¹See THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 28. 129-133.

reduction of the teaching staff; history will repeat itself, in that the subjects lopped off will not be considered at all, and the rest will be no more effectively handled, so long at least as schoolmasters continue to talk of what they can do "with the amount of work we can secure from our students."

<525> though the task of writing English into Latin is so much more difficult than that of translating Caesar or Cicero or Vergil into English, strange to say the colleges require candidates for admission to perform the harder task absolutely at sight; on the other hand the translation from Latin to English is almost wholly in prepared work.

As long ago as 1908 I had been greatly irritated again and again by the fact that speakers and writers spent their energies in describing at length what was wrong with the teaching of Latin without making the slightest attempt—or at least any serious attempt—to suggest a remedy. I recall too many papers in which the speaker or the writer, having used up fifty minutes (or many pages) in a jeremiad, said, in effect, "I have not time to suggest a remedy". As a rule he *did not*, I was sure, have a remedy in mind, or even the faintest glimmer of a remedy. Destruction is always easy; construction is difficult. I could myself take a watch apart. I could not, in a thousand years, put the pieces together again, or substitute for the watch something as good, or better. In the article from which I quoted above I devoted more than half of my space to the suggestion of remedies for some, at least, of the real difficulties that then <1908> confronted teachers of Latin in the Schools. I stressed something not in reality new in those days (the reading of Latin at sight), but I gave a new emphasis to the matter, by advocating something which then was new, namely the making of all entrance examinations in Latin virtually examinations at sight. As a means toward this end I urged that pupils studying Latin in the High Schools be required to master a basic vocabulary of some 2,000 words (based on Professor Lodge's list, then new), and I proposed (528)

. . . a reformulation of the requirements for admission and a reform of the mode of conducting examinations. The requirements may be set forth as follows: a thorough and accurate knowledge of inflections and of the chief principles of syntax, a vocabulary of 2,000 Latin words and their English equivalents, the ability to scan the hexameter meter, and a careful study of some prescribed portion of Latin literature of not more than 1,500 lines in length. The intent of the examinations on these requirements might well be defined as the testing of the candidate's knowledge of Latin and his ability to use that knowledge. To that end the examinations should be made almost wholly sight examinations. Since the meanings of all words not included within the 2,000 can be given on the examination paper, the candidate may be expected to translate with substantial accuracy and into good English. No allowance whatever need be made for ignorance of word-meanings or for slovenly English.

The examination might well be divided as follows:

A. Prose Composition.

1. Detached sentences, designed to test knowledge of forms and of the chief principles of syntax.
2. A short passage of easy narrative designed to test the candidate's ability to write Latin consecutively.

B. A passage of moderate difficulty from some Latin prose author to be translated at sight.

C. A passage of moderate difficulty from some Latin poet to be translated at sight.

D.

In the examinations under A, B, and C, the Latin equivalents for all English words not readily translatable by the aid of the selected vocabulary, and the English equivalents of all Latin words not in that list should be given

It will be seen that, at every point, I was, in 1908, definite and concrete. More than twenty-five years ago I suggested some of the concrete things suggested by Professor Carr in the paper read by him, in 1933, before The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. As long ago as 1908 I wanted to restrict the scope of the School work in the writing of Latin by definitely limiting the range of principles of syntax with which, in that work, teachers and pupils would be expected to deal, and by definitely limiting also the vocabulary. I was urging, as were others in those days, that pupils be expected to master a selected vocabulary of Latin words, with their English meanings. In my article in *The School Review*, in what I said about the examinations I proposed I was urging that, in setting passages for rendering from Latin into English, those who set examinations for admission to College should, in selecting English sentences and a connected English passage to be turned into Latin, restrict themselves to the basic, selected vocabulary, and should therefore, as a matter of course, give, on the examination paper, the Latin equivalents of any English words or English expressions that might lie outside the group of English equivalents of the Latin words in the selected vocabulary.

All my experience, all my observation, all my reflection since I wrote as I did in 1908 have confirmed and deepened the views I held at that time. I am no more willing to eliminate from the Schools the writing of English into Latin (within the limits so sharply defined by me in 1908) than I was twenty-five years ago. Retreat before difficulties has no more charm for me now than it had twenty-five years ago. In my judgment the writing of English into Latin is an indispensable *sine qua non* to a knowledge of the language, as indispensable for the pupil who would really learn to read Latin as it is for the prospective teacher of Latin (whose whole contact with the language may be purely professional, without ever bringing him or her to the point of appreciating, or even being really interested in, Latin literature).

It seems, at first blush, unbelievable, but it is none the less true that no one, since 1908, has published the kind of 'Latin Composition' book, for use in the Schools, called for by my statements in the article from which I quote above. I ought to have pressed on to write such a book myself. I regret now that I did not at least try to do so. My belief that some one else would surely do so is no excuse for my neglect to act on my own principles.

So far as the English-Latin vocabulary for such a book was concerned, the materials have long been ready at hand, not only in Professor Lodge's list, but in the numerous other lists prepared at a later time. In the field of syntax, too, there has been help at hand. Any competent teacher should, of course, have been able to

make a selection of the chief principles of Latin syntax. Such a selection would have eliminated much that appears in most, if not in all, 'Latin Prose Composition' books. To supplement and control selection of syntactical principles we all have had at our disposal such a book as that prepared by Mr. Lee Byrne (and others), entitled *The Syntax of High School Latin*. This book was published by the University of Chicago Press in two editions (1909, 1918). These editions were reviewed by Professor Lodge and myself, in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 3.33-34 (October 30, 1909), and 12.157-158 (March 24, 1919). In 1929 Mr. Barclay W. Bradley published *An Index of Latin Syntax for High School Prose*. This pamphlet, which consisted of sixty-three large pages, was published by the Associated Book Store, Los Angeles, California. Of course such books must be used with caution. The frequency or the infrequency of a given word or a given construction in a particular Latin author, or group of authors, may be a result merely of accident or of special circumstances. A Latin word which it is difficult to use correctly is *certus*. Yet it appears in every selected Latin vocabulary which aims to include all Latin words that, in a given territory, appear five times or more. Now it appears with frequency in that territory for just one reason, Caesar's fondness for the expression *certiorem facere*. It would have been entirely right, and far wiser, to omit *certus* from all the selected vocabularies. Mr. Byrne brought out the fact that in High School Latin (I mean the normal trinity, Caesar, Cicero, Vergil) *quamquam* is rare. In spite of that fact I myself should include it in the Latin writing to be done in the High School. All pupils ought to know, certainly all teachers ought to know, the difference between *quamquam* with the indicative (objective, obstructive, NOT CONCESSIVE AT ALL), and *quamvis* (*licet*) with the subjunctive (this is subjunctive, concessive, granting something for the sake of argument, for the sake of argument *willing* something to be true, without giving an inkling of what really is, from the point of view of writer or speaker, true).

I have little, if any, patience with those who, because they wish themselves to be quit of the task of teaching the writing of Latin, or because they wish to make things easier for teachers (!!) of Latin, advocate the elimination from the School curriculum of the writing of Latin. I have even less patience with those who, as part of their plea in this connection, laugh, as Mr. Farrand did over twenty-five years ago, at teachers who attempt to make their pupils write as Cicero wrote or as Xenophon wrote. Such arguments are grievously unfair. Those who thought about the matter seriously and sensibly NEVER attempted to teach pupils in the High Schools to be Ciceros and Xenophons. Mr. Farrand was belaboring men of straw of his own creation.

Not in the College nor even in the University should the attempt be made to teach students to be Ciceros or Xenophons. I have taught, with great and unflinching delight, the writing of Latin all through my career, mostly, of course, in the undergraduate College sphere, but also in the graduate sphere, both at Columbia University and at the University of Chicago. I have always demanded that *in vocabulary and in syntax* my

students should keep Caesar and Cicero unflinching in mind. I seldom allowed them to use a construction which is common, let us say, in Livy, but is not common (or is non-existent) in Caesar or in Cicero. I have, however, never set before myself or before my students the imitation of the *style* of Caesar or Cicero as a *primary object* of their work in the writing of Latin. Of course, I repeatedly emphasized some detail of the style of Caesar or Cicero, such as the periodic structure, effective word-order (e.g. chiasmus). But such work has been incidental, the crown of the remainder of the work, a sort of prize for continued devotion to the rest of the work, which is inevitably less spectacular, less rewarding, but absolutely indispensable.

A knowledge of Latin words, of niceties of meanings (e.g. of *quavis* versus *quisquam*), and a firm grasp of certain important principles of syntax can be gained, my long experience has taught me, best through the writing of English into Latin (within the definite limits I have had in mind all through my teaching). Such knowledge of words and such knowledge WILL help the student to *read* Latin more quickly and with finer understanding. If any one says they will not, I am convinced that this person has not given proper thought to what he was saying, or else that, never having learned to write Latin himself, he knows nothing about the matter, and that, as a consequence, his utterances on the subject are valueless.

In my long experience, too, I have come upon many teachers (!!) of Latin who "hated" Latin writing. When I looked at the papers they handed to me, I knew why. *They could not write Latin. If they could not write it, how could they teach others to write it?* They must, if they had any measure of honor and honesty, have been terribly embarrassed again and again by questions put to them by pupils, or even in their own studies or offices as they sought to 'correct' papers. To such teachers of Latin proposals to eliminate the writing of Latin would, naturally, be welcome. Again and again, as such teachers made progress in writing the kind of Latin I wished to have them write, their attitude changed. *Being able now to do the thing, they were quite willing to teach it.*

I expressed above my regret that no one had prepared the kind of 'Latin composition book' for use in Schools which, it seemed to me, we have so long needed. In *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 8.202-204 (May 8, 1915) Mr. Charles H. Breed, who was then at the Lawrenceville School, but is now at Blair Academy, Blairstown, New Jersey, had an article entitled *A Plea for the Reorganization of the Work in Latin Composition in Secondary Schools*. Mr. Breed made a series of concrete suggestions, as follows (204 A):

There is not sufficient time here to go deeply into the possible lines of division <between the so-called Elementary Latin Composition and the so-called Advanced Latin Composition>, but for mere illustration of the principle we may observe that it is obvious that for study previous to Cicero we could advantageously omit verbs governing the genitive case, complex passive constructions, idiomatic accusatives, expressions of value and price, independent subjunctives, commands and prohibitions (direct and quoted), all uses of the gerund and gerundive except those with *ad* and *causa*, conditional sentences (except the three normal types in

direct discourse), and conditional clauses of comparison. There should also be a limit to the vast array of temporal, causal, and concessive conjunctions, and of substantive clauses. It is clear that great stress should be put upon purpose, result, indirect discourse (barring complex dependent clauses), questions direct and indirect, important case constructions, and particularly upon the principles of agreement. By laying stress upon just such selected points of syntax, and by drill in a selected vocabulary, tutors who make no effort to give a *course* in composition, but who attempt merely to cram the pupil for the immediate needs of the examination test succeed amazingly well in pushing boys into College. But no legitimate text-book on the market dares to suggest such a process. Certainly all who believe in the teaching of Latin as a language, and not as a piece of apparatus for gambling would welcome any move tending to make the work in Latin composition a really progressive process, and one above all else thorough at every stage.

To such thoughtful proposals as these Professor Carr's proposals in the paper which called forth my present remarks are as far removed as darkness is from light, as death is from life. The easiest way—the way taken too often by Colleges and Universities in connection with matters that trouble them either in administration or in regard to the curriculum—is to eliminate the thing that *seems* to be causing the trouble. All too often the *seeming* cause is not the cause at all. So is it, I think, with the writing of Latin in the Schools. The causes there are lack of ability, on the part of pupils and, all too often, of teachers, indolence, the surrender to other and utterly unimportant things (extra-curricular activities!!!) of the time and the effort that ought to be consecrated (I use the word deliberately) to study. Along with all this goes the ever-increasing tendency to make life pleasant and easy (for the moment) for both pupil and teacher, without regard to the harvest that must be reaped some day by those who do not labor at the right season, who do not learn when they have a chance to learn. "Work while it is day, for the night cometh when no man can work" is still a sound message.

CHARLES KNAPP

COMMENTS ON PROFESSOR CARR'S PAPER IV. BY PROFESSOR E. ADELAIDE HAHN

Many of the points advanced in Professor Carr's paper may, it seems to me, be dismissed with a few words as more or less irrelevant to the subject under discussion.

(1) Punitive methods in vogue at Kings College in 1771–1775 have no real bearing on the matters of which Professor Carr is writing. Practices advocated by Professor Carr himself, "such as copying, writing from dictation, . . . reproducing passages from memory. . . .", have also been employed for punitive purposes, without thereby losing educational value.

(2) The comparatively small amount of time devoted to 'Latin prose composition' in the Colleges¹ is

¹Professor Carr's statement that the use of 'prose composition' in our Colleges "has all but disappeared as a requirement except as a part of the professional training of prospective teachers of Latin" indicates that those directing the training of such "prospective teachers" realize the importance of 'Latin prose composition' when a *real* knowledge of Latin is deemed vitally necessary. It is to be noted in this connection that at least one institution advocates the

not relevant. The College has—or thinks it has, or hopes it has—the right to expect its students to come to it already adequately drilled in the rudiments of writing Latin, so that practice in this art need no longer form an integral part of every College course in reading Latin. The College teacher of Latin will, however, have to take up the burden of training his pupils in the fundamentals of writing Latin if the High School teacher of Latin abandons it, just as the High School teacher of Latin has had to take up the burden of training his pupils in the fundamentals of grammar since the Elementary School teacher of English has abandoned it. Delay involved in mastering these fundamentals seems to me deeply regrettable.

(3) Over-weighting of the importance of 'Latin prose composition' by a minority of High School teachers of Latin is no argument against 'Latin prose composition'. It is interesting to note that, according to Professor Carr, a majority, or at least (in the case of the fourth year) a plurality, of a fairly large group of teachers would give one-fifth of the time in *every* year to 'prose composition'; one need no more agree with the 74 who would so devote from one-third to two-thirds of the first year's work than with the 144 who would do no 'prose composition' at all in the fourth year. The giving of marks in Latin "exclusively or almost exclusively on the results of tests in 'prose composition'" I should certainly agree with Professor Carr in condemning (even though I find that superiority in reading Latin and superiority in writing it regularly go hand-in-hand)²; but that assuredly does not mean that 'prose composition' should count for little or nothing.

(4) Irrelevant, too, are arguments based on methods used in the acquisition of the vernacular, such as these: "most children learn to read their native language long before they learn to write it", "thousands of human beings all about us are living useful and literate lives without being conscious that there is such a thing as grammar" Could our students of Latin, starting at the most plastic age, spend all their time in a *milieu*

study of 'prose composition' on academic rather than on strictly professional grounds. Hunter College advises that all its six one-point 'prose composition' courses "be taken by those who expect to pursue graduate work in Classics". Colleges in general are, I believe, more enthusiastic in meeting the demands of the Graduate Schools than High Schools in general are in meeting the demands of the Colleges.

²This does not, to be sure, seem to be confirmed by Professor Henmon's findings for French as cited by Professor Carr. But I have grave doubts about the applicability to the study of ancient languages of facts concerning the study of modern languages, and *vice versa*. In regard to this point I believe Professor Carr would probably agree with me, since he himself refers (in his sixth paragraph) to the difference in objectives of the study of modern languages and those to be pursued in the study of Latin.

³Perhaps we are not unjustified in seeking something more than the merely "useful" or the merely "literate"! It is an open question how thoroughly one understands, or how felicitously one uses, even one's own language without intelligent insight into its grammatical principles. I know that the tendency now-a-days in our Elementary Schools is to dispense entirely with the study of grammar; but this new practice has yet to prove itself. I am aware that the statement has been made that the study of English grammar has no bearing on the student's correct use of English; yet I cannot but wonder how teachers can effectively correct their pupils' mistakes if there is a complete lack of grammatical knowledge on the part both of teacher and of taught. How can a distinction be made between *who* and *whom*, between *lay* and *lie*, if teacher and pupil alike are unable to distinguish nominative and objective, transitive and intransitive? What explanation will such a teacher give in correcting Johnny when he says, "The book was laying on the table"? "Come to see Mary and I"? He can give Johnny no reason for altering his habits other than "Say it this way because it's right", or "Say it this way because I tell you to do so". This procedure seems to me indefensible, from the standpoint both of intellect and of ethics.

where nothing but Latin was spoken, drinking it in constantly for a year or two before making any attempt whatever to reproduce it, they *might* dispense with practice in 'prose composition' or with the study of grammar. But this is obviously impossible, and "the psychology of learning" forbids our applying to the boy or the girl of fourteen years the treatment suitable to the infant of fourteen months.

(5) Irrelevant, again, are expressions of personal predilections on the part of unselected groups of students. I note that 89% of 3,319 fourth-year pupils "liked translating from Latin to English better than translating from English to Latin . . ." It might be interesting to compile statistics on the answers, by students in the average High School, to such questions as the following, "Which do you like better, studying Latin or studying Spanish?", "Which do you like better, studying Spanish or going to the 'Movies'?" Would the statistics when obtained necessarily provide a cogent guide to the views on education to be adopted by the teacher of Latin?

(6) Of little importance, too, are illogical or infelicitous statements in Grammars or Beginners' Latin Books. Probably the first two rules cited by Professor Carr from "our most recently published Latin Grammar"⁴ would be improved in logic if recast more or less as follows: "*Quasi* is used in Latin to express the idea expressed in English by *as if*, The mood used in a *quasi*-clause is the subjunctive", "The use of the indicative mood introduced by *quamquam* indicates that the thing stated or conceded is vouched for as a fact. The use of the subjunctive mood introduced by *quamvis* indicates that something is stated hypothetically (not vouched for as truth)". But I do not see that the blame for these—or other—instances of unfortunate phraseology (which are due often to failure to grasp the distinctions between the mother-tongue and the foreign language often to the very sort of simplification that Professor Carr advocates) is to be imputed to the practice of 'Latin prose composition'.

In any case the citing of unhappily worded rules is not proof that rules are not needed by the student who is successfully to read Latin. Surely one does not get a *full* understanding such as an intelligent and conscientious student probably will, and certainly should, demand that his studies enable him to obtain, if he does not understand the difference in meaning between the imperfect and the pluperfect subjunctive, between *cum* with the present subjunctive and *cum* with the future indicative, between *sub* with the accusative and *sub* with the ablative, if he does not know his way about among the various uses of the ablative, thirty-one in number though they be (these thirty-one become much clearer when grouped as subdivisions under three main heads, as they must be by the satisfactory Grammar and by the thoughtful teacher, in the interests of linguistic accuracy and of logical adequacy⁵). I do not

say that all these details should be heaped on the head of the first-year student; I think they had better be acquired gradually, as they are reached and needed; but I do think they should be there in the Grammar, for reference, ready for the student when he is ready for them⁶.

In certain matters that are really highly important matters I take issue now directly with Professor Carr. The first of these is a tendency which I believe I detect in his article to be satisfied with second-best. This is manifested in his readiness just discussed to approve a Grammar deprived of all the fine points (and even some of the not so fine points) that, some of us feel, go to make up the real genius of the Latin language. I see two other manifestations of the same tendency.

(1) Professor Carr states that "many persons read quite well languages which they can scarcely write at all . . ." If this statement has reference to hardly literate persons dealing with their own language, it is irrelevant. If, on the other hand, Professor Carr has reference to students of a foreign language, I maintain that we should not be concerned with a type of study that enables the student to succeed only "quite well". By "quite well" Professor Carr means, I am assuming, 'fairly well'. If his meaning is rather 'perfectly well', I question not his ideals but his facts. Possibly a scholar of great linguistic training and experience, after mastering a number of other languages, may acquire complete command of the *reading* of a language that he could *write* only with considerable difficulty. But such a case has no bearing on the case of the student still in High School or even on the case of the student still in College. I doubt whether it would apply even to the average mature scholar.

(2) Professor Carr approves the lightening of our Latin program, in regard to which he makes the parenthetical comment that it "is unquestionably more difficult in each year of the course than most programs that compete with it for pupils . . ." Suppose it is! The question is, For what type of pupil are we competing? Should we try to entice into classes in Latin pupils who do not belong *there*? To do so will be to work injustice to them, to their teachers, and above all to the pupils who *do* belong there, to whom will be offered a program emasculated in an attempt to fit it to the capabilities of the inferior and the incompetent. Those who succeed in doing first-class work in Latin do it only through the possession of real intelligence and the exercise of real industry. *These* by all means let us try to attract to our classes; the way to do it is, I am sure, not by attempts (bound to be unsuccessful in any case) to match our rivals in competitive underbidding.

I note here, with great satisfaction, that the students who at Hunter College elect the 'Classical Major' come to such work not only with heart-warming enthusiasm for it, but with an excellent knowledge of Latin (and, in some cases, of Greek too). Such students reflect great credit upon their hard-pressed teachers in High School. to point out, merely makes the process of classification all the more interesting and illuminating.

⁴See the distinction admirably made between the Grammar and the first-year book by Dr. B. W. Mitchell (THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 23.97) in his fine review (97-102) of the very Grammar that Professor Carr has in mind.

⁴It is of interest to note that the author of this grammar, to whose approach from the point of view of English Professor Carr not without justice objects, has himself protested effectively against the same tendency. See THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 20.59-60.

⁵That a certain amount of overlapping occurs in the process, as the satisfactory Grammar and the thoughtful teacher will not fail

To such students lightening of the Latin programme would make no appeal.

Certain exercises suggested by Professor Carr I do not disapprove, though I should regard them as supplements to 'Latin prose composition' rather than as substitutes for 'Latin prose composition'. I believe in writing Latin answers to Latin questions. I believe in "completion exercises" (though I find that my own beginners do more poorly with them than with translation into Latin, and seem to gain less from them). I am a little skeptical, however, about "re-writes" and *résumés*, for I fear the students will either cling too closely to the original text to gain real value from the work, or depart too widely from it, with consequent loss in correctness (the average beginner does not know what he knows how to say and what he does not).

Even more dangerous than *résumés* to the beginner is the practice of absolutely untrammelled 'free composition'. I fancy Professor Carr would not advocate this, and that, when in his paper he talks about "writing Latin" he means 'translating English into Latin'; yet he really seems to have free composition in mind when he makes the statement, "in reading a language one goes from word to idea, while in writing a language one has to go from idea to word . . ." In reading Latin without translating it (the method practised by those who really know Latin, but in my opinion, beyond the ability of High School students), one goes from word to idea; in 'free composition' one goes from idea to word. But in translation from language A to language B (it does not matter whether A, or B, or neither, is the vernacular), surely the process is always from word to idea and then again to word, that is, one reads the words in language A, decides what idea these words convey, and then decides how best this idea may be conveyed through words in language B.

Professor Carr hopes to see a certain "carefully planned and carefully carried out experiment . . ." However the scales may incline, if such an experiment is made, I shall not be quite ready to admit that the last word in the matter has been said. To my mind no experiment, no matter how carefully controlled, appears utterly convincing and complete if it involves that highly variable, immeasurable, and unpredictable factor, the human mind. To compare class A with class B at the beginning of period x, to treat A and B with meticulous care, employing identical methods save only as involves factor q, to recompare A and B at the end of period x, and to decide that any new differences observed are due to the presence or absence of q, is good scientific method so far as we can compass it; I shall view the seeming results of such an experiment with interest and respect. But I shall never be quite assured that B is an adequate check on A; the only experiment that could completely satisfy my doubts would be the one performed if some Wells or some Einstein could show us how to reverse the time-machine so that, having tested class A during period x

¹On the other hand, I think the ability to read a modern foreign language without translating it is within the grasp of the High School student. This is one of the fundamental differences underlying what should be, in my opinion, corresponding differences in the aims and the methods of the study of Latin and the study of modern foreign languages.

with factor q inserted, we could start all over again with that same class A at the beginning of period x, as it was at the beginning of period x, and eliminate q, then at the end of this second period x compare the resulting A with the A produced after the first period x, individual with individual.

HUNTER COLLEGE

E. ADELAIDE HAHN

REVIEWS

Excavations at Olynthus. Part 1: The Neolithic Settlement. By George E. Mylonas. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press; London: Humphrey Milford; Oxford: University Press (1929). Pp. xvii, 108. 2 Colored Plates, 95 Figures. \$7.50.

The first excavations conducted by Professor D. M. Robinson on the site of ancient Olynthus recovered the remains of a neolithic settlement. The task of publishing the finds was entrusted to one of Professor Robinson's students, George E. Mylonas, who has since that time distinguished himself through his excavations at Eleusis, Hagios Kosmas, and elsewhere.

Inasmuch as the contents of this book have to do with a culture that is wholly pre-Hellenic and even pre-Helladic, their discussion hardly belongs to the field of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY. It will be sufficient, therefore, to quote the author's summary of the results of his studies (96):

. . . The first settlement at Olynthus was founded towards the close of the 4th millennium B.C. by tribes who did not belong to the Indo-European race. They had no metals and they used stone for their tools and weapons. Their civilization, primitive as it was, was not very crude. They were no longer "food gatherers" but they were "food producers". They no longer depended on the fruit of the trees and on the berries of the bushes for their livelihood, but they cultivated the soil and had domestic animals. The discovery of carbonized remains of wheat, millet, figs, of bones of domestic animals, proves that they were farmers and shepherds. The absence of weapons discloses the peaceful character of the settlers. . . . They produced good pottery, plain and more seldom incised and painted, which they baked in elaborately constructed and regulated kilns. With their primitive stone and bone tools they also made beautiful stone bracelets, stone vases and stone celts. Their religious ideas are unknown, but they must have been advanced and of an anthropomorphic nature, if we consider the figurines and the small-legged vases as representations of goddesses and as altars. Their village was finally destroyed by an invading foe. The fate of the survivors is unknown, but they never returned to their ruined village and the site remained unoccupied till historical times . . .

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

A. D. FRASER

Excavations at Olynthus. Part 2: Architecture and Sculpture: Houses and other Buildings. By David M. Robinson. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press; London: Humphrey Milford; Oxford: University Press (1930). Pp. xxii, 155. 311 Figures, 1 Plate, 3 Colored Plates. \$20.

In 1928 Professor D. M. Robinson began excavations at Myriophyto, in Macedonia, a site where, he believed, the ancient city of Olynthus had been situated. The results of the first season's work were hardly conclusive

for establishing the identity of the place, but the campaign of 1931 and more especially that of 1934 have completely vindicated, to all appearances, the faith that Professor Robinson has manifested throughout.

The work here under review records the fruits of the first campaign of excavation. No city wall was found, no temple, and—what is more remarkable—no inscription; but an abundance of house-walls came to light, and the plan of the streets of the ancient city was discernible before the excavations were very far advanced. It would now appear that the sector then unearthed was in large measure a residential block of the city of Olynthus—possibly a suburb that lay beyond the circuit of the walls.

Olynthus proved faithless to Philip of Macedon, and was attacked, captured, and destroyed by that monarch in 348 B.C. The adjective 'Olynthian', employed as a personal name, does not altogether disappear from Greek literature. It persists in fact for several centuries. But we have no historical notice of the rebuilding of the city. A restoration of some kind has generally been assumed by historians. One of the most important results of the initial campaign was the unearthing of evidence that gave rise to a strong presumption, which has more recently been confirmed, that no subsequent Greek settlement was made on the site.

The book contains the following chapters: I, The South Hill (1-15); II, The Religious and Municipal Centre (16-34); III, The North Hill (35-98); IV, The Shopping and Trading District (99-111); V, The Outlying District of the East Side (112-117); VI, The Loom Weights (118-128); VII, The Lamps (129-145).

From a perusal of this table it will be seen that the work is not quite what it purports to be, i.e. an account of the architectural and sculptural remains of Olynthus, but rather a detailed narrative of the various stages of the excavation and a record of the chief finds in each sector. It seems best, therefore, to regard the book as an amplified log kept by the director of excavations, a log supplemented by a few special studies. Considered as such, it is worthy of the highest praise. I understand that a complete study of the architecture and town-planning of the site will soon be published by one of Professor Robinson's students who assisted at the excavations.

The work is very fully illustrated—something for which the reader should be grateful. It may be that the pictures are not of equal merit. Figures 138 and 193 are made from light-struck negatives, and Figure 157, where motion is involved, had too long an exposure. But, under the conditions that prevailed at Olynthus, it was undoubtedly very difficult to make everything turn out just right in so far as photography is concerned.

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

A. D. FRASER

CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

X

"Scientia"—November, Review, generally favorable, by A. M. Pizzagalli, of M. Mühl, *Die Antike Menschheitsidee in Ihrer Geschicht-*

lichen Entwicklung; Review, uncritical, by A. M. Pizzagalli, of W. Capelle, *Die Germanen im Frühlicht der Geschichte*; December, Review, favorable, by Ettore Rota, of G. Lavagnini, *Saggio sulla Storiografia Breca*.

The Times Literary Supplement (London)—September 6, Review, favorable, of Hayford Peirce and Royall Tyler, *L'Art Byzantin*, Tome II; Review, generally favorable, of Frederick M. Padelford, *The Axiochus of Plato*, Translated by Edmund Spenser; Review, generally unfavorable, of Arthur S. Way, *Lucretius on the Problem of Existence in English Verse*, of Charles Foxley, *Verse Translations from Lucretius*, and of N. H. Romanes, *Notes on the Text of Lucretius*; Brief review, favorable, of *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum: United States of America*, Providence: Museum of the Rhode Island School of Design, Fascicule I, by Stephen B. Luce, and, mildly unfavorable, of *The Robinson Collection*, Baltimore, Fascicule I, by David M. Robinson, with the assistance of Mary W. McGehee; Brief review, favorable, of R. S. Conway, J. Whatmough, and S. E. Johnson, *The Prae-Italic Dialects of Italy* (three volumes); Brief review, favorable, of Thomas W. Dougan and Robert M. Henry, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Tuscularum Disputationum Libri Quinque*, Volume II [the volume contains Books III-V]; Brief review, very favorable, of H. B. Mayor, *Seventy Odes of Horace*, Translated into English Verse with Notes and Latin Text; Brief Review, qualifiedly favorable, of J. R. Watmough, *Orphism*; September 13, Abelaerd's *Love-Poems*, Jack Lindsay [a letter to the editor in which evidence is adduced to support "the theory that No. 131 of the *Carmina Burana* (*Hebet sidus*) was (written) by Abelaerd"]; the suggestion is made that Numbers 103 and 37 (*Terra iam and Dum Dianae*) may also be his work]; September 20, *New Light on (John) Skelton*, Ian A. Gordon [the writer of this letter to the editor quotes some (supposedly) hitherto unpublished Latin verses by Skelton and some laudatory verses entitled *Carmen Extemporale* written by Erasmus to Skelton, in his honor, this material is derived from two manuscripts in the British Museum]; Brief review, generally unfavorable, of Gaston Delaysen, *Cleopatra* (translated by Farrell Symons); September 27, Review, qualifiedly favorable, of Percival R. Brinton, *The Hunting of the Snark*, by Lewis Carroll, Rendered into Latin Verse; Sandys' "*Metamorphoses*", Russell H. Barker [a letter which discusses some matters concerning editions of George Sandys's translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (1626)]; *New Light on Skelton*, John Lloyd, H. L.

R. Edwards, and E. Ellam [further letters to the editor commenting on the substance of I. A. Gordon's letter in the issue of September 20, and correcting it]; October 4, Review, mildly favorable, of Helen Waddell, *Beasts and Saints* [prose translations from medieval Latin]; Brief review, qualifiedly favorable, of L. Lamprey, *All the Ways of Building* [an outline history of architecture, illustrated by Hélène Carter]; October 18, Review, favorable, of A. E. Taylor, *Philosophical Studies* [the first five of these Studies deal with Greek philosophy], and of A. E. Taylor, *The Parmenides of Plato*, Translated into English, with Introduction and Appendices; Review, favorable, of Arthur L. Wheeler, *Catullus and the Traditions of Ancient Poetry*; November 1, Review, mildly favorable, of Jack Lindsay, *Caesar is Dead* [an historical novel, sequel to *Rome for Sale*]; Brief review, mildly sceptical, of A. Y. Campbell, *Horati Carmina Viginti Restituit Emendavit*; November 8, Review, favorable, of Robert Graves, *Claudius the God and His Wife Messalina* [a sequel to *I, Claudius*]; "Caesar is Dead", Jack Lindsay [a letter commenting on the review of the writer's novel, *Caesar is Dead*, in the issue of November 1]; November 15, Review, very favorable, of Rt. Hon. L. S. Amery, *The Stranger of the Ulysses* [a "delightful collection of fantasies"]; Brief review, favorable, of G. D. Roberts, *An Anthology of Latin and English Verse*; Brief review, favorable, of J. G.

Milne, *The First Stages in the Development of Greek Coinage*; Brief Review, generally favorable, of Henrique Perdigão, *Dicionário Universal de Literatura*; November 29, Brief review, very favorable, of C. G. Pope, *The Story of Scipio Africanus, Part I: In Spain and Sicily*, from Livy; Brief review, unfavorable, of Warner Fite, *The Platonic Legend*; December 6, Brief review, favorable, of Raymund Klibansky, *Magistri Eckardi Opera Latina, I: Super Oratione Dominica*; Brief review, favorable, of Sir Herbert Thompson, *A Family Archive from Siut, From Papyri in the British Museum, Including an Account of a Trial before the Laocritae in the Year 170 B. C.* (two volumes); Brief review, very favorable, of William C. Wehrle, *The Macaronic Hymn Tradition in Medieval English Literature*; December 13, Review, generally favorable, of Cecil F. Lavell, *A Biography of the Greek People*; Brief review, uncritical, of Denys L. Page, *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy, Studied with Special Reference to Euripides' Iphigeneia in Aulis*; December 27, Brief review, qualifiedly favorable, of Basil Anderton, *Into the By-Ways: Translations into Latin*; Brief review, uncritical, of Arthur S. Way, *Speeches in Thucydides and Funeral Orations, Translated*; Brief review, uncritical, of J. F. Mountford, *The Scholia Bembina*, Edited with Annotations.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY,
MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT

JOHN W. SPAETH, JR.